



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,663	09/23/2003	Victor C. Yang	4100.001482	5598

4743 7590 05/07/2007  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300  
SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/668,663

Applicant(s)

YANG ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-50 and 55-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-50, 55, 56 and 59-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

1. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed June 28, 2006 on November 2, 2006 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Disposition***

2. Claims 48-50 and 55-70 are pending. Claims 48-50, 55-56 and 59-70 are under examination.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed on November 2, 2006 has been considered. A copy of the PTO-1449 form is attached.

### ***Maintained-Specification Objection***

4. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

As previously stated, the specification is objected to because trademarks are disclosed throughout the instant specification and not all of them are capitalized or accompanied by the generic terminology. The use of the trademarks such as TWEEN-20<sup>®</sup>, for example, have been noted in this application (see page 62). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort

Art Unit: 1652

made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Correction of the above is required.

***Maintained-Claim Objection***

5. The claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 48-50 and 59-63 are objected to for improper dependency.

Claim 63 as amended is objected to for the recitation of "wherein at least a coagulant is further administered", for clarity, it is suggested that the claim is amended to read, "The method of claim 64, further comprising administering a coagulant to said mammal".

Correction is required.

***Maintained-Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 48-50, 55-56 and 59-70 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 1652

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a method of inactivating heparin or low molecular weight heparin with purified protamine fragment. The claims are defined only by functional properties, not by a structure. Thus, there is no indication of which purified protamine fragment the claimed invention is directed to. Note for example that claim 67 is directed to a first and second protamine, which provides evidence that there can be more than one protamine fragments, however, no structure is provided. In addition the claims are directed to a method that utilizes the undefined protamine and a coagulant (see claim 63), which is also undefined. Furthermore, the art teaches that protamine given to neutralize heparin after extracorporeal circulation can trigger a catastrophic reaction in some patients (see Tan et al. Anesthesiology, Feb. 1989, vol. 70, no. 2, pages 267-75). Therefore, the claimed invention needs to adequately describe the protamine fragment intended in the method. Thus the claims lack adequate written description to demonstrate to a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. See *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir.1997). Therefore, a biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. For example, even though a genetic code table

Art Unit: 1652

would correlate a known amino acid sequence with a genus of coding nucleic acids, the same table cannot predict the native, naturally occurring nucleic acid sequence of a naturally occurring mRNA or its corresponding cDNA. *See MPEP 2163*. The newly submitted claim also lack adequate written description because the claim does not set forth what effect of heparin is intended.

Further, *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of encoded proteins, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. *See Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993). *See MPEP 2163*.

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 48-50, 55-56 and 59-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claim 55 lacks clear antecedent basis for "said purified protamine" as the claim was amended to recite "purified protamine fragment". See also claims 48-50, 65-67 that has the same issue. The dependent claims hereto are also included in this rejection.

Claim 69 is indefinite for the recitation of "ameliorates an effect of heparin or low molecular weight heparin" as it is unclear what effect of heparin is resolved.

#### *Response to Arguments*

8. The response filed on November 2, 2006 has been considered, however, is not fully persuasive. As the amendment filed did not address the objection to the specification the objection remains. The claims remain objected to for the reasons of record and based on the amendatory language for the reasons stated above. In addition, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 first and second paragraphs have been maintained.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the claims recite a protamine fragment that has reduced immunoresponsiveness or toxicity compared to native protamine. However, no structural limitations are provided in the claim as to what said fragment looks like. It is noted that the claimed protamine is modified to achieve the reduced immunoresponsiveness or toxicity, however, the claims do not establish what those modifications are. Thus, a skilled artisan would not be able to envision the detail chemical

Art Unit: 1652

structure of the protamine fragment. The art recognizes that the protamine structure comprise 31 amino acids per molecule and only five types of residues: arginine (20), glycine (6), serine (3), alanine (1) and tyrosine (1). The primary structure of protamine is reported and the N-terminal sequence contains the four hydroxylated amino acids of the molecule; the C-terminal region shows a sequence of eleven adjacent residues of arginine and contains all the glycine residues present in the protein. However, there is no indicia as to where in the native structure modifications will occur such that the resultant effect is a fragment of protamine that has reduced immunoresponsiveness or toxicity and will inactivate heparin or LMW heparin. Thus, the claims encompass a genus of fragments not adequately described. Hence the rejection remains.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, based on the amendatory language new grounds of rejections have been instituted. However, claim 69 remains problematic for the reasons stated above. Applicant states that "perusal of the current claims evidences heparin-related conditions", and pointed to claims 59 and 62, however, claim 69 depends from claim 55, which does not recite this information. Therefore, the rejection remains because the art recognizes that heparin can inactivate thrombin and that heparin is a prophylaxis of thrombosis and the claims recite, excessive bleeding associated with a trauma or surgery or systemic heparinization or extracorporeal blood circulation etc., thus it is unclear what "specific effect heparin is ameliorating in claim 69".

### ***Conclusion***

9. No claims are presently allowable.



Art Unit: 1652

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new/modified ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Primary Examiner

4/12  
5/5/07  
HOPE ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER